000027876

CORRES. CONTROL INCOMING LTR NO.

01671RF 24

DATE

ACTION LTR ENC DIST. BERMAN, H.S. CA: NIVAL, G.J. CC: P. R.D. CORDOVA, R.C DAVIS, J.G. FERRERA, D.W. FRANZ, W.A. HANNI, B.J. HEALY, T.J. HEDAHL, T.G. HILBIG, J.G. HUTCHINS, N.M. KELL RE KIRBY, W.A KUESTER, A.W. MAHAFFEY, J.W MANN, H.P. MARX, G.E. MCKENNA, F.G MORGAN, R.V. PIZZUTO, V.M. POTTER, G.L SANDLIN N.B. SATTERWHITE, D.G. SCHUBERT, A.L. SETLOCK, G.H. STIGER, S.G. SULLIVAN, M.T SWANSON, E.R. WILKINSON, R.B. WILSON, J.M.

CORRES CONTROL x x ADMN RECORD/080 PATS/T130G

Reviewed for Addressee Corres, Control REP

Cons

Ref Ltr. #

DOE OADER # <u>5400.3</u>

RF-46522 (Rev. 01/94)

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH Dedicated to protecting and improving the health and

Denver, Colorado 80222-1530 4210 E. 11th Avenue

environment of the people of Colorado



Covernor

Patricia A. Nolan, MD, MPH Executive Director

CERTIFIED MAIL # P 392 Return Receipt Requested

Laboratory Building

(303) 691-4700

Denver, Colorado 80220-3716

April 14, 1994

4300 Cherry Creek Dr. S.

Phone (303) 692-2000

Mr. Richard J. Schassburger U.S Department of Energy Rocky Flats Plant Building 116 P. O. Box 928 Golden, Colorado 80402-0928

Request for Extension, Draft & Final Phase I RFI/RI Report for OU 9

Dear Mr. Schassburger,

The Colorado Department of Health, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division (the Division) and the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have received and considered DOE's March 17, 1994, request for a modification to work for the Final OU 9 RFI/RI Workplan and schedule extension for the submittal of the Draft and Final OU 9 RFI/RI Report (94-DOE-02962). For the specific reasons set forth below, the Division, acting as lead regulatory agency, hereby denies your request for a schedule extension and, as of your receipt of this letter, DOE will be in violation of the IAG.

As with OU 8, DOE is attempting to convince CDH and EPA that extensions to the milestones for submittal of the Draft and Final RFI/RI Report for OU 9 are justified because of a proposal to modify work. This argument is not accepted. DOE remains liable for any delay incurred as a result of 1) a failure on DOE's part to secure adequate funding under the terms of the IAG, and 2) a unilateral DOE-RFO decision to allocate no funding to OU 9 for RFI/RI implementation. DOE's own supporting documentation (93-DOE-08269) admits insufficient funding in FY 93 and FY 94.

DOE is notified, therefore, that stipulated penalties will accrue automatically from the date DOE receives this letter for the Draft OU 9 RFI/RI Report, and September 6, 1994, for the Final OU 9 RFI/RI Report. Through the IAG, DOE has agreed to pay up to \$5,000 for the first week and \$10,000 for each week thereafter for the late submittal of primary documents. Penalties will continue until such time that a satisfactory draft and final report are submitted. We will consider the draft and final OU 9 RFI/RI Reports to have been submitted when we receive reports which document completion of efforts as specified in approved Workplans and any subsequent amendments thereto. These efforts must be designed to support the decision process required to identify a final remedy/closure for IHSSs within OU

In addition, DOE's statement that the proposed modification justifies the extension request is completely untenable in that you are asking for more time to do less work. DOE must realize that we cannot, and will not, approve either open-ended modifications to work or open-ended extension requests.

The agencies are aware that the issue of accessibility was raised repeatedly during Workplan development. The agencies understood that the scope of work included in the approved Workplan was already based on the accessible portions of OU 9. This was evidently not the case even though there are several portions of the approved Workplan that recognize portions of the OU are inaccessible. Because your letter does not define the portions of the OU 9 Workplan that cannot be implemented because of previously unidentified access problems, and does not propose any alternatives, your request for a modification to work is not supportable at this time.

The issue of the changed mission for the Rocky Flats Plant may be a reason for modifying certain portions of the OU 9 Workplan, once a properly scoped and approved modification is developed. It is not, however, justification for a schedule extension. The fact that almost none of the work planned for OU 9 has yet been implemented is not a function of the new plant mission. Rather, as mentioned previously, it is a function of inadequate funding.

The agencies continue to support the efforts underway to revise and revamp the cleanup strategy for the industrialized area. We have stated since at least March, 1993, that we believe these efforts are warranted. We have given informal response to ideas forwarded by both DOE and EG&G but have yet to receive any formal proposal. So far, it is not evident that our responses and comments have had any effect. Regardless, the present opportunity to restructure work in the industrialized area is a result of not only the plant's mission change, but DOE's non-performance of industrialized area IAG work. It must be clear that DOE remains liable for this non-performance.

If you have any questions concerning these issues, please contact Dave Norbury of my staff at 692-3415.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Baughman, Chief

Facilities Section

Hazardous Waste Control Program

cc: Daniel S. Miller, AGO
Jackie Berardini, CDH-OE
Martin Hestmark, EPA
Arturo Duran, EPA
Bruce Thatcher, DOE
Wanda Busby, EG&G
Zeke Hauk, EG&G